DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 053 CS 503 059

AUTHOR Grayshon, Matthew C.
TITLE The Possible Contribution of Social Grammar of Language Analysis to Inter-Cultural Communication and the Avoidance of Misunderstanding.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 14p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (30th, Acapulco, Mexico, May 18-23, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Contrastive Linguistics: Cultural Differences: Language Classification: *Language Research: Language Universals: Language Variation: *Mutual Intelligibility: *Social Influences: *Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS Intercultural Communication

ABSTRACT

Different languages code messages in different ways and use different channels for sending messages; thus there are many places for misinterpreting and mishearing messages in an intercultural context. To move from one language to another requires a description of the total language communication system, one that has its universals in social and individual functions. Such a total language system attends to functions and channels such as words, word order (syntax), phonetic structures, paralinguistic features (tone, pitch, rhythm), facial expressions, posture, and head and body movements. Taking these and relating them to discourse analysis in a variety of languages, sociolinguists can build up descriptions of languages and classify languages. For example, work with West African tonal languages illustrates their differences from English in their levels of linguistic discourse to show social patterns. By approaching language study in this manner, sociolinguists can identify areas where misunderstandings occur across languages and cultures at noncawareness levels, and modify language instruction to circumvent these problems. (The descriptions of a social grammar and its elements and uses are illustrated by two anecdotal studies of English-West African sociolinguistic differences.) (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196053

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Possible Contribution of Social Grammar of Language Analysis to Inter-Cultural Communication and the Avoidance of Misunderstanding

Matthew C. Grayshon

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Matthew C. Grayshon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503059

A great deal of work is being done in discourse function, analysis and description. The discourse analysis people are making structural statements and specifying precise relationships between forms and functions. They realise, as we all do, that there is a complexity of levels relating utterances and the social situation in which they are presented, they are plotting their way from social situation. My position is the opposite - I am starting from the social situation and trying to see what utterances are needed to perform on that social situation. Both approaches are valid; both have their strengths and weaknesses. The main weakness of the discourse analysis approach is that it is valid ONLY for the language in which it is operating. We must not assume that the analysis of many conventional utterances we shall be able to say that this pattern of linguistic forms, hesitations etc. which holds good for English, holds good for other languages. However if we turn from English we must not assume that the same linguistic forms will give the same social information. This is the limitation of this approach - it is valid ONLY for one language at a time. My work, initial though it is, shows that in West African tonal languages different levels of linguistic discourse to the ones of English are used to show social patterns. By approaching from the social situation and asking questions of the following variety, we reach patterns from the other side, as it were.

"How do you show anger"
"To whom can you show anger"
"Do you use a different form to be angry to a superior as well as to an equal"

We involve ourselves with different universals. A language description has to deal with social situations where, for example, the husband/wife relationship varies from society to society, and inside society. 'Henpecked' is a social description, but we may make the judgement from utterances; so there should be a describable order of utterance that would allow us to describe to a learner of that language how to recognise the abnormal pattern of social relationship 'henpecked'.

From the social point of view we have first to know if the relationship 'henpecked' is a viable one in the foreign culture; then find out what linguistic levels reveal it; and finally correlate the English language levels with the foreign language levels. Now in the foreign society 'henpecked' might not exist but an analagous one of 'cockpecked' might! The two are examples of a general category status, sub-category male/female married ... so then we can suggest to the foreign language speaker the linguistic terms of his language and the comparable linguistic terms of English.

What I am saying can be summarised in the following table:

1	2	3
English	Social Category	Foreign Language
discourse utterance	social description	discourse utterance

Analysis of 1 or 3 leads to 2; but analysis of 1 or 3 cannot lead to 3 or 1. By starting at 2 and utilising the descriptions of 1 and 3 one can reveal a universal that allows relationships between 1 and 3 for a comparative linguistic description. This is particularly true when languages are, as it

were, a long way away from each other, as are tonal languages and English.

The limitations of my approach is that it cannot be fully effective until there has been effective analysis of discourse function. In its initial stages it can only show broad contradictions and broad universals.

Another way of looking at the two approaches is that discourse analysis does its work inside certain linguistic and social conventions or parameters within a single language. Social Grammar is concerned with the definitions of these conventions, drawing the parameters as well as being concerned with the linguistic form.

I would like to turn to the matter of lack of fit between linguistic form and linguistic function. There is an implicit suggestions in this term; it suggests that there is a fixed form, or a fixed function, and that with a bit of juggling or manipulation a fit can be made. This, I suggest, is a misleading implication for the following reasons. First, language function is not fixed, but is a social convention that can and does change; as with meaning its function is what we want it to be. Linguistic description, by the nature of scientific method, by the nature of the descriptive process, is a description frozen in time, and always in the process of being reified. Therefore the two can never be made to fit without a continuous redefining and restatement of linguistic form terms. And, to underline a previous point, the linguistic convention of one linguistic group is not the linguistic convention of another group. This is also true of social descriptions; they are limited to time and place. But just as linguistic form is based upon a finite number of universals which we refer to with such terms as phonemes, intonation, pause etc., and the RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN them, so societies are based upon a number of finite universals which we refer to as status, emotion etc., and the RELATIONSHIP between them. One aspect of the discovery and mapping out of language is to make the map of the relationships between these two groups of relationships. And, if possible, postulate some pattern of change so that we do not fall ever further and further behind in our cognition of language.

So we finish where we started: the theoretical standpoints are complimentary and not mutually exclusive. We each need to understand the other in order that each may make sensible progress.

To return to my main theme it will be seen that I am attempting a macro description of the 'informing' process that will hold good for all 'informing' systems.

It is now necessary to break down this word 'information' to the various levels that I see at the moment, and then relate these to the 'informing' process.

Definitions

LANGUAGE (T) - The TOTAL communication system.
LANGUAGE (U) - Utterances which sub-divide into:
Language (l) lexis (words)
Language (s) syntax (word order)
Language (p) phonetic structures
Language (i.s.) paralinguistic features
i. tone (voice movement up and down)
ii. pitch (tone contrast)

iii. loudness and softness
iv. emphasis (loud and soft contrast)
v. rhythm
vi. pause
vii. permutations and combinations of these.

LANGUAGE (F) - Facial expression and head movements.
LANGUAGE (B) - Body movement and posture.
i. body posture
ii. arm positions
iii. leg positions
iv. body space utilising

and then there is the general use of the word LANGUAGE (L) for naming languages such as English, Yoruba etc. and finally the idea of LANGUAGE (W) communication by writing with its sub-categories of (i) alphabetical/phonetic and (ii) ideographic.

From these comes the formula:

$$T = (U + F + B)$$

and as language (T) is human behaviour produced by group interaction and interpreted by individuals, so we can have the symbolic representation:

$$\frac{S(T = (U + F + B)}{I}$$

where S is the cultural (or sub-cultural) system in which the language (T) operates and which interact with each other; whilst I is the individual who interprets, judges and performs.

The main use I have found for these two formula is a convenient shorthand form of holding in my mind a complex situation.

Taking the series LANGUAGE (T) (U) (F) (B) the individual items need some further discussion.

Language (T) This is the total communication behaviour of the individual and I suppose the total communication pattern of his Language (L). It is also made up of various sub-languages (T) of gangs, jargons and dialects, but this I shall not follow up. The language (T) is what the individual uses for maintenance in society, for domination, for a weapon, for getting his own way, for cooperating, for learning, for discovery. This is the behaviour that makes him different from the rest of the animal kingdom. Language (T) is an active process and develops and changes as the individual changes. It is a continuous interactive process over time. And, as it is part of my behaviour, it is also part of other people's behaviour who are operating vis-a-vis me. The gross cultural mileu in which we work is the language (T) of the language (L).

Language (U) This is the noise part of the communication process - what I refer to as utterances in Grayshon, 1977.

(There is a problem of locating language read aloud from a literary source; reading badly from a play script, reading from a poorly dialogued play ..... provisionally I placed them on a continuum reaching from language (U) to language (W) and they may provide a way of studying the relationship between (U) and (W)).

Language (F) and (B) These, of course, make up the field that is known as kinesics and body language. I find it interesting that the study of (F) and (B) is sharing the two points of view. One is building up a descriptive grammar of gesture and posture; the other is interested in what the gesture communicates. As long as the first method is related to a particular language (L) then it will be of use; similarly with the second method. To assume that all ethnic groups all the individual language (T)/language (L) use the same gestures etc. for the same purposes and with the same meaning is of course nonsense. Apart from its general interest value, showing this is the main purpose of Desmond Morris's 'Manwatching': I do not think this is what he intended, but the squirrel-like collection of (F) and (B) starts at the wrong end - with the gesture and then allocates meaning from one or two languages. To be of use there would be a dictionary with three columns - column 1. gesture; column 2. ethnic group (or sub-group) who use it; column 3. the meaning. This requires the items with the greatest content to be listed first which is uneconomic. The better way is the intention or meaning first, then the ethnic group and then the gesture. It is this series that I hope that social grammar will eventually build up.

From communication theory we can derive a pattern:

Source - selected code - channel received code - receiver

The source and the receiver are the individual humans with their physiological and neurological behaviours. These code our communication wishes in the appropriate patterns; these patterns are outlined above, as I see them at the moment. They are based upon physiological pairs used in our informing processes:

	Initiator	Receiver
i.	sound/silence	hearing (ears)
ii.	movement/non-movement	sight (eyes)
iii.	body contact	body contact (all over)
iv.	smell from body parts	olfactory (nose)
v.	taste	taste (mouth)

Whilst many animals live in a smell-centred world and whilst smell might have an important part in the growth of communication of the young child it and taste I ignore for the moment. Tactile experience and body contact is very likely the basis of communication from very soon after birth though there is not space to argue the case.

The first pair have been the main study of linguists until recently and it has been assumed that these carry all the information necessary. However I have shown that this is not so and that information can be exclusively passed at a non-verbal level. It is the realisation of this that has made me search for universals in the functions that create the forms and which require coding what ever society one belongs to.

ANALYSIS

Briefly the social elements that I have used for this analysis fall into two groups. First there are those that describe the social functional background and then the second group describe the individual requirements of the communication system.

The social background are the three elements of Status, Solidarity and Emotion.

Status Status is not a fixed position in society but a relationship between two people or groups of people or language groups. There are two basic situations, that of superior-inferior and that of inferior-superior. A superior is a person (or group) who are in a position of power and therefore have more say in decisions of how Language (T) might be used, what forms are permissible, and who can use them and when. This is not limited to political power but is power in its widest sense. The general rule is that the superior has more Language (T) choices than the inferior and that the actual choices available are both individually and socially controlled by the superior. For example in the Army the position is summed up by the following:

"Permission to speak Sir."
"Not granted."

and that is the end.

One can at the same time be both inferior and superior according to the role one has in society. Some societies are fixed, others are fluid. It is the status position that interprets Language (T) behaviour as 'polite', 'rude', etc.

Solidarity Is the second universal and is either the state of friendship or of neutrality as far as status is concerned. This latter is the staple of much day-do-day Language (T) interaction. This is described by such vocabulary items as 'intimate friends', 'close friends', 'acquaintances', etc. It is essentially informal as opposed to formal there is a degree of freedom on EITHER side.

This solidarity relationship modifies the status relationship. It is possible for one to modify into the other. The Major and the Captain have a certain relationship on the parade ground, but off it they have a different one. The Captain has more opportunities off the parade ground to initiate conversation, he has more choices at hand; but the situation can immediately be changed by the superior stating:

"You're presuming on our friendship", and re-introducing status.

Emotion These have had limited discussions in sociological circles. They are difficult to define as they involve physiological states as well as social actions. For the moment we can manage with the everyday words such as anger, hate, sorrow, love (both erotica and agape), patience, surprise etc. As far as the social grammar of language is concerned there are three ways in which emotion affects Language (T).

1. Neutral emotions — The absence of emotion, this includes many social actions, conventional thanks, conventional politeness, etc.

2. Joining emotions — When the expression of emotion joins two people together.

3. Rejecting emotions — When the emotion separates two people.

Discussing these last two a little more. I can be angry with John, you are also angry with John; our anger joins us and separates us from John. Emotion for my purposes has direction, it either joins or separates. In order to live I have to know which way the emotion is going - is it intended to separate or to join. Even as an observer I must have this knowledge. These differences lie in the communication process. The direction of the anger is made manifest in the Language (T).

"I'm furious with David" or by the striking of a blow, or by a gesture.

Sometimes it is situational as when my wife comes in, slaps down the basket hard on the table and says something like:

"Well, really."

I know that the anger is directed at something that has happened outside, and is not directed at me. How do I know? What has cued me?

Now comes a very important fact. That whilst normally status decides what Language (T) can be used AND what emotion may be expressed and in what way, and whilst solidarity allows some modification of this state of affairs, a VERY STRONG EMOTION will overrule the social constraints. If I am angry enough, or frightened enough I will burst the socical barriers.

Having defined the context we now come to the categories which are used for analysis. These at the moment are seven. These are derived from the needs of the individual in the social situation.

1. Commands — I need and want to get other people to do things for me. With enough status I DEMAND them.
2. Requests — If I have not enough status to give orders I make requests.
3. Refusals — I want to refuse to obey an order, I want to go my way not his way.
4. Questions — I need information of one kind or another.
5. Responses — I need to reply to someone else's initiative.
6. Statements — At the moment all Language (T) that is not in the other categories!
7. Abuse — There seems to be a personal and social need to insult, to denigrate, to do down.

All these are functional social terms and not grammatical descriptions derived from formal descriptive grammar, elsewhere I discuss the odd concept of "lack of grammatical fit" where the form is seen as more important, and previous to the function and intention that produced and developed the form. Language is essentially a social and individual tool fashioned for various purposes. As society and the individual changes so the Language (T) changes and the forms are used in different ways and the same forms can change their use.

My initial research showed that in Yoruba, Nupe and Igbo (three Nigerian languages) items carried in lexis and syntax (language (l) and (s)) in these languages moved down to Language (i.s.) in English and that in Mernkwen items

that were in Language (B) were in language (l) and (s) in English.

These findings led to further research and a sabbatical year in Nigeria in 1975/76 funded by the Nigerian Government. The results of this research programme suggest that languages fall into two main groups:

A. SYNTACTIC SEMANTIC TONE LANGUAGES. These are the languages that have as a basis the long and short vowels with consequent patterns of stressed and unstressed syllables and the tone over the sentence used to convey meaning. The final fall to the home note, the fundamental frequency of the individual voice is used to state the social intent that the utterer has completed an utterance (the equivalent, as it were, of the other endings give other items of information plagal cadence in hymnology). This group includes English, and probably most European languages of Latin, Greek and Germanic origin. In Nigeria it includes Hausa, Kanuri, Kemberi, Yala, Basa and Idoma.

B. LEXICAL SEMANTIC TONE LANGUAGES. These take as their basic the short vowel and the down terracing of the voice till the home note is reached. If the home note is not reached then a vowel sound is often added on to give the psychological satisfaction apparently required for completion on the home note. Change of meaning is by the change of tone inside a vcv cluster. This is often a subtle sound change not heard by speakers of languages in group A. This group includes Angas, Yoruba, Efik, Igala, Nupe and Yukun in Nigeria.

At the present stage of my researches, it is not at all clear if these two groups are in opposition or are at two ends of a continuum. From initial evidence provided by Yala and Basa and to a lesser degree by Hausa it is possible that they are at two ends of a continuum. Idoma is very interesting because my correspondents kept stating "We do not say that, we do it." Much of what is in Language (J) in English is in Language (F) and (B) in Idoma.

There are a number of consequences of this discovery for international communication.

1. It is difficult for speakers of one group to learn the other group languages. It is very difficult for English speakers to learn Yoruba or Igbo but so much easier to learn Hausa. Igbo and Efik speakers do not learn Hausa or English easily. In all these cases the speakers finish up with strong accents which are very difficult to overcome. The law of diminishing returns soon sets in.

2. Because information which shows awareness of status and emotion is carried at different levels then there is ample room for misjudgements of whether people are being polite, cheeky, rude, brusque, etc.

Of these two the first is not directly relevant to the conference. The second is so there follows a discussion of two situations where the social grammar approach shows up areas of possible conflict and misunderstanding.

EXPERIMENT ONE: To show the lack of understanding of social and emotional informational carriers in the English Language by Nigerian students.

This work was carried out in four Nigerian Educational Institutions. A Federal Secondary School, two Voluntary Agency Schools and a State Government Teacher Training College. It involved 251 students of both sexes. The medium of instruction in all Institutions was English. The staff of the Institutions was mostly Nigerian with one or two English.

The procedure was that I had prerecorded what purported to be one end of a telephone message. The speaker was a woman using standard English. She was given the following instructions:

> Please imagine that this is your end of the telephone conversation. It has begun with greetings then your friend at the other end reminds you of an engagement and says something like.... "Are you coming round this evening then?" You do not particularly want to go, and you do not particularly care for the person ringing up so you reply fairly brusquely and this is your end of the conversation.
>
> .... "Am I coming round this evening? Well.... no. I'm sorry I've got a hockey practice."
>
> Pause - other end is speaking.
>
> "Yes, I know I promised but I forgot about the practice."
>
> Pause - other end speaking.
>
> "I'm sorry you've arranged things, but I just can't come - the hockey practice must come first."
>
> Pause - other end speaking.
>
> "Okay then, see you, goodbye."
>
> Please record this conversation again using exactly the same words and word order, this is important, but this time show that you really are sorry, you just do not want to upset the speaker at the other end of the 'phone.

The recorder did not need to discuss the instructions with me but straight away made a good recording. It was not in the least difficult for her to use the same words not to give the social information required.

The recording then was tried out on twelve English people who all immediately recognised the intentions of the speaker. A smaller group of nine Americans also had no difficulty.

The recording was played to groups of students. They were allowed to hear as many times as they wanted. They were also asked to write down what difference if any they heard between the two recordings. My explanations were amplified by the class teacher. Every effort was made to see that the students understood what was wanted and we did not proceed unless both the class teacher and myself were as sure as we could be that they understood.

I discussed what had been done after the students had written down what they thought they had heard.

The results are disturbing. Of the 251 students, 92 (36.65%) did not perceive ANY difference; they did not hear any difference: 152 (60.55%) heard a difference but attached no informative element to those differences. These subjects who are being taught in English have only a limited knowledge of English at a crude lexical and semantic level only. It is interesting that 27 out of 30 Hausa heard the difference which is what I would expect as the two languages use the same signalling levels for the same purposes. Of the 67 Tiv 29 (43%) heard no difference and of the Yukun 18 (47%) out of 38 heard no difference. The languages involved numbered forty but only the Hausa, Tiv and Yukun were in sufficient number to give signficant results relevant to a single language.

What this means in social terms is that if all those students were transferred to England only seven of them would realise that they had been given the brush-off in a similar situation!

At least the need for further research using this social grammar of language approach is indicated.

EXPERIMENT TWO: To show the possibility of the different use of pitch and vowel length between Igbo and Yoruba as a contribution to unfavourable stereotypes.

When I was in Nigeria there was considerable prejudice amongst many English persons against the Igbo. They were considered to be pushing, brusque, rather rude. They were present all over the country, taking advantage of the better and much more plentiful educational opportunities of their own area, to trade, to staff Federal departments, and semi-Government organisations such as the Cocoa Boards, the Cotton Buying Board, and Federal organisations such as the Railways, the Electricity Corporation, and (an important factor in the myths and developments of the Civil War) fifty per cent of the middle officer army ranks were Ibo. Some of the dislike was due to the great difference between the traditional rulers of the North and their still hierarchy of governance, and the much more democratic organisation of Igbo society which is emphasis on the clan and family, and the very loose-knit political organistion without hereditary chiefs. The hierarchically minded Administrator was happy with the hierarchical Northerner and uncomfortable with the much more democratic Igbo. Bearing in mind that with Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe and his colleagues in the forefront of the Independence debate, the quite ruthless business and go-getting attitude of the Igbo, plus the mutual incomprehension over governance with which the English came to conversations with the Igbo, there was a hidden background of considerable prejudice. (How far the strongest Christian organisation in the Eastern Region was the Roman Catholic Church working mostly through Irish missionaries upset the relationships has not been explored). In this situation communication is, with a common language (L), fraught with the possibility of misunderstanding. If the two languages use different codes for the passing of status and the associated politeness, and one of the codes can be misinterpreted, then misunderstanding must increase.

A. Evidence 1

According to linguistic form descriptions Igbo is a terraced tone

language and has a downdrift type of intonation. It is in my description, also a lexical semantic tone language. Compared to English the eight vowels are all short. In 'Twelve Nigerian Languages' we are advised:

"Igbo speakers have difficulty in:

i. Learning to place the stress correctly in words and sentences.

ii. Varying the length of English syllables so as to achieve the correct rhythm.

iii. Learning to produce the appropriate English intonation patterns."[4]

What they do produce are the fundamental patterns of their own language, the overall 'coarse' sounds that they were hearing and associating with parental and other adult behaviour in the months from birth until they were able to start the discriminating communicating process that develop into words and syntax. So their basis (i.e.) is this downdrift of tone. This to the English ear is a falling tone with short vowels.

B. Evidence II

In English we have a number of intonation patterns, the one we are concerned with is the falling tone. With other conditions this is the tone associated with the giving of orders; with sharpness. One of the conditions is the shortening of the vowel value. When we want to give orders, show displeasure one of our options is to either use words that have short vowels or shorten the vowel values of the words we do use.

C. Evidence III

In the status context only the high status person can give orders using the downward intonation and the shortened vowel values. If someone of lower status does this then the social value judgement is made that that person is rude, brusque, etc.

D. Evidence IV

Igbo has, as all languages have to do, the social lubricant that we refer to as 'good manners'. This is often done by posture, or a kinesic factor at the beginning of the utterance, by the use of the appropriate title. It does not have the complex politeness structures that English has. One of the complaints of Igbos about English is that we are so polite, i.e. we use 'please', 'thank you', 'do you mind', etc. in so many areas where they are not necessary in Igbo.

E. Evidence V

When I was in Enugu, on my first visit to Igbo country, in 1976, I was given as a guide a seventeen year old girl. She was at secondary school and taught in English. During the journey she had to give me various instructions about turning right, left, straight on etc. These came out with quite short vowels, and in a falling tone. There were no politeness words such as we use in the English sentence, and, of course, there was no modifying of the lexical and syntactic pattern by the use of the rising tone. The one where we start halfway up the scale and finish three or four notes higher. My first, and second thoughts were moving on the lines of "A somewhat ill-mannered

young woman." But third and subsequent thoughts made me realise that this was most unlikely. I had just interviewed an older sister for a place at university and I was going on to meet another fellow Igbo with similar purposes in mind. Again, one is not usually gratuitously rude to a guest. Obviously, again, the code she was using was a mixture of her mother-tongue and my mother-tongue. The lexical and syntactical were intelligible, but the (i.s.) and (F) and (B) were from Igbo and I was either not receiving or misunderstanding.

This made me watch and ask questions. Now first of all respect and politeness was given to me at the moment of meeting when the young woman bobbed a curtsy; she also avoided looking me in the eye. During the journey when she spoke to me and answered my wife's questions she carefully avoided looking us in the eye. From time to time there were little bobs of the head. Secondly, if a status high person asks a status low person to do something, in the case under discussion, to give instructions to guide me to another place, in Igbo there is no need for politeness words, simple instructions are enough - after all I have asked her to do this!

Discussion

From then on I set out to watch the Igbos in their communication pattern with each other. Once a conversation has started, it was difficult for me to pick up any clues as to emotion, status and intention. Right at the beginning posture, place of looking, set the scene. The politeness that we include in (i.s) are not, indeed cannot be in Igbo because of the very different structure of the language. How to carry out instructions is treated differently, in the sense of communication patterns related to social situation.

Now multiply this situation with the many others of daily intercourse in the office, in the workshop, etc. add this to a bustling go-ahead people, there is a very potent ingredient in misunderstanding.

I must be very careful and not claim too much on this evidence. At the least it is suggestive that as communication is human behaviour, that any misunderstandings of communication is misunderstanding of behaviour and that this misunderstanding if repeated in communication situation after communication situation is one of the factors that go to build up unfavourable (or favourable) stereotypes. At the most I have shown that in certain situations misinterpretations do occur due to mismatch of codes, and that this can have serious repercussions. Enough evidence has been given for far more research to be done in this field.

I mention adding to a favourable stereotype. There is a case for suspecting that the Hausa speaker got off to a good start in stereotyping because of the match of codes between English and Hausa. There is a fuller discussion of Hausa later on but I have shown that it is a syntactical semantic language like English and not a lexical semantic language like Igbo. Therefore down at the (i.s.) level we have a code carrying similar information. Also at this level, the patterns seem to carry the same sort of information, the downward fall with short vowels is authority: the level or rise fall rise fall with longer vowels show favourable emotions. Therefore the Hausa comes to the communication situation with similar codes using similar patterns for coarsely similar information. I also suggest, later, that these likenesses inside the syntactical semantic languages, and

the formulation of the lexically semantic languages are development of basic physiological necessities going different ways.

A priori, from the very different forms of the two languages, Igbo and English, we would expect that codes are:

i. made up differently

ii. used differently

Traditional descriptions have shown i. but because they have a descriptive approach and because this approach limits the ability to describe how they are used they have not been in a position to show ii. I have started this work, and, because I consider language (T) to be both social and individual behaviour I am able to start the relating of code to function and the comparison of code/function and code/function across languages.

As with the previous experiment more work needs to be done to show if the same misunderstandings operate over other discourse patterns. But I believe that this approach is important and very fruitful and gives a means of exploring differences.

Conclusion

As different languages code messages in different ways and use different channels for sending messages then there are many places for misinterpreting and mishearing messages. We cannot assume that the forms created by one language are used in the same way in another language or that messages are sent down the same channels. To move from one language to another we need a description of Language (T) that has its universals in social and individual functions. Taking these and relating them to discourse analysis in a variety of languages we can then build up both descriptions of languages and also classify languages. For Communication Study purposes in this section of intercultural communication we can then identify areas where misunderstanding can occur at a nonawareness level and bring them out and even include them in language teaching. Social Grammar of Language is a description of these universals in its first tentative stages.

Grayshon, M. C. (1977) Towards a Social Grammar of Language. Mouton, The Hauge.